

Statistical Transmutation and Phases of Two-Dimensional Quantum Matter

FRANK WILCZEK[†]

*School of Natural Sciences
Institute for Advanced Study
Olden Lane
Princeton, N.J. 08540*

★ Invited talk at the 150th anniversary of Boltzmann's birth, Academi Lincei, Rome, June 1994.

† Research supported in part by DOE grant DE-FG02-90ER40542. wilczek@sns.ias.edu

ABSTRACT

After surveying the quantum kinematics and dynamics of statistical transmutation, I show how this concept suggests a phase diagram for the two-dimensional matter in a magnetic field, as a function of quantum statistics. I discuss the fundamental properties of quasiparticles in the different phases, and briefly suggest *gedanken* – but not manifestly infeasible – experiments to show up these properties.

I feel my subject may be something of an anomaly here, since it does not grow in any very direct way out of Boltzmann's great work on statistical physics, and indeed involves at its core concepts that were totally unknown in Boltzmann's day. However in a broader sense it is an appropriate homage, since it speaks, in a way that is both direct and I think quite beautiful, to Boltzmann's overarching ambition to relate microscopic laws to macroscopic behavior. So without further ado, let me describe for you how fundamental new possibilities for microscopic laws governing identical particles in quantum mechanics underly some spectacular recent discoveries in condensed matter physics [1].

1. Rules of Quantum Statistics

1.1. QUANTUM KINEMATICS: EXCHANGE AND BRAIDING

The fundamental specification of the dynamics of a quantum-mechanical system must be a rule for calculating transitions amplitudes. Let the amplitude for a process wherein n particles at initial positions $(r_1^{(I)}, \dots, r_n^{(I)})$ arrive at positions $(r_1^{(F)}, \dots, r_n^{(F)})$ through path λ be denoted

$$A(r_1^{(I)}, \dots, r_n^{(I)}; r_1^{(F)}, \dots, r_n^{(F)}; \lambda)$$

or $A(I \rightarrow F; \lambda)$ or even $A(\lambda)$ if no ambiguity arises. The usual way to specify transition amplitudes is in terms of an action functional of the form

$$A(\lambda) = \exp\left(i \int_{(I)}^{(F)} \Pi dr_j \mathcal{L}(r_j(\tau), \dot{r}_j(\tau))\right). \quad (1.1)$$

The complete amplitude is obtained by summing over all paths, which gives the Feynman path integral. This general form has the advantage that it automatically

incorporates the rule for composing amplitudes for consecutive processes, that is

$$A(\lambda_{1+2}) = A(\lambda_1)A(\lambda_2) , \quad (1.2)$$

where the path λ_{1+2} is obtained by first following path λ_1 and then path λ_2 . If, in addition, $\mathcal{L}$ is taken to be the classical Lagrangian, then the system obeys the correspondence principle.

The correspondence principle guides us in finding the laws of quantum dynamics, but it is not determinative, since it certainly can happen that different quantum systems have the same classical limit.

New possibilities arise, in particular, when the space of paths is topologically non-trivial – that is, when there are different sorts of path that cannot be continuously deformed one into another. (Here I am speaking, of course, of paths in n -particle position space. When I wish to speak of the trajectories of individual particles, I will call them world-lines.) The classical equation of motion can be reproduced by comparing only infinitesimally nearby paths, according to the variational principle. Thus the classical limit gives us no guidance as to how to weight the amplitudes for topologically distinct path sectors relative to one another.

Let us consider how these remarks apply to the case of indistinguishable particles. In specifying the state of indistinguishable particles, one can specify only that there are particles at n given positions, but not any ordering among them.[★] Thus in calculating transition amplitudes we are interested in paths that begin at n given points $(r_j^{(I)})$ and end at n given points $(r_j^{(F)})$, which may or may not be different from the initial ones. There is one quite obvious way in which these paths do fall into topologically distinct sectors. That is, if one path consists of world lines which connect the $r_j^{(I)}$ to $r_{P(j)}^{(F)}$ with some permutation P , and another path

★ This should seem obvious on first hearing, but startling upon reflection. After all, one is accustomed to working with antisymmetric wave-functions for fermions, and clearly the value of such a wave-function is ambiguous in the absence of a preferred ordering. This is a simple case of a general phenomenon that is fundamental for the physics I am discussing here, to which I shall return shortly.

consists of world lines which give a different permutation, then the paths certainly cannot be continuously deformed one into the other.

Let us specialize for the moment to just two particles. Then of course there are just two distinct classes of permutations. If we suppose that the only topologically distinct classes of paths are those that differ by a permutation, we can pin down the possibilities by using (1.2), as follows. The classical amplitudes (that is, the amplitudes formed according to Feynman's prescription using the classical Lagrangian) automatically satisfy (1.2), and the question is what additional, intrinsically quantum-mechanical, weights we can apply to the different topological sectors. We must obtain the same amplitude by considering the overall composite process where the two world-lines go through the sequence $(A, B) \rightarrow (C, D) \rightarrow (E, F)$ as for the sequence $(A, B) \rightarrow (D, C) \rightarrow (E, F)$, since (by hypothesis) world-lines of these types do not differ in *overall* topology. But this means that the extra weighting factor must give unity upon squaring. Thus this factor must be ± 1 . These two possibilities correspond, of course, to the familiar cases of boson and fermion statistics.

One fine point: I said the fundamental objects were transition amplitudes between states, but in fact physics really makes do with a little less. We actually only need that the product of an amplitude $A(I \rightarrow F; \lambda_1)$ for one path with the complex conjugate $A(I \rightarrow F; \lambda_2)^*$ of the amplitude for another should be unambiguously defined, since it is only such interference terms that ever appear in physical expectation values. This is important even for fermions, where there is a possible ambiguity in defining "direct" versus "exchange" processes, when the initial and final configurations do not consist of the same points. Fortunately, if we change our mind as to which is direct and which exchange we only change an overall phase common to both amplitudes, which is not physically significant.

In the foregoing I have implicitly assumed that the only topological distinction among paths is captured by the permutation induced by their component world-lines. This assumption is correct (and intuitively obvious) in three or more space

dimensions, but turns out to be false for two space dimensions, even for two particles. Indeed, the number of times the world lines wind around one another as one follows the path from initial to final configurations, is a topological distinction. (We also accept half-windings, for the exchange process.)

Two subtleties deserve to be addressed before this proposed distinction is accepted. First, one might be concerned that the topology is ruined by the possibility that world-lines cross. This is not true, however, because the crossing itself is a discrete identifiable event, and one can attach a multiplicative phase factor (supplying the difference between the two topological classes) to its occurrence. Second, the number of windings is not really well defined if the configuration of initial points is not the same as the configuration of final points. This is closely related to the problem we encountered above for fermions, and its resolution is the same: the ambiguity affects an overall phase common to all the paths, but does not affect any physically significant expectation value. To resolve the ambiguity *does* however require us to make a small adjustment in our concept of a wave-function. In the present context, indeed, the wave-function is not uniquely defined as a function on the configuration space. It has a sort of gauge invariance, in that by changing our convention as to the which braiding (to use the technical term) is regarded as the reference braiding, we may change the overall phase of all the amplitudes, but nothing physical. For fermions this was only a two-valued ambiguity, and can be absorbed by the artifice of making the wave-function antisymmetric. This implicitly involves a two-fold covering of the identical particle configuration space. As we shall soon see, things are not always quite so simple.

Acting within the richer topological structure of the path space for two-space dimensional systems, the implication of (1.2) is less severe than in higher dimensions. Since a path with r windings followed by a path with s windings yields a path with $r + s$ windings, it is consistent to add the phase factor $e^{2ir\theta}$. Bosons correspond to $\theta \equiv 0 \pmod{2\pi}$, and fermions correspond to $\theta \equiv \pi \pmod{2\pi}$. There is a continuous range of possibilities in between, classified by the angle θ . Particles with these quantum statistics are generically labeled *anyons*. For anyons, the

wave-function must keep track of the number of windings. One way to do this is to let the relative angle ϕ between the particles run from $-\infty \rightarrow \infty$, and impose the condition

$$\psi(\phi + \pi) = e^{i\theta} \psi(\phi) . \quad (1.3)$$

1.2. EMBODIMENTS AND EXTENSIONS

It is straightforward to extend these considerations from 2 to n particles. In three or more space dimensions, the paths fall into classes labeled by the permutation group on n letters, with composition of paths corresponding to composition of amplitudes. (1.2) tells us that in determining the relative weightings of the different classes we are free to choose a one-dimensional representation of the permutation group. There are exactly two possibilities for this, which of course just give us the familiar cases of bosons and fermions.

In two space dimensions, the topological classification of the paths is more complicated. The group of these classes, with the group operation corresponding to composition of paths, is the mathematical object known as the braid group. The braid group is a complicated non-abelian group, but its one-dimensional representations are quite simple. They are labeled by an angle θ , which is essentially the angle we already saw in the 2-particle case. To get the weighting factor for a given path one adds the windings for every pair of world-lines to find the total winding r , and multiplies by $e^{2ir\theta}$.

The wave function for a many anyon system will be subject to condition (1.3) for every relative angle. The simple appearance of this condition is totally deceptive, because the relative angles form an awkward, partially constrained and partially redundant, set of variables.

Several generalizations of the original concept of anyons are possible. One may allow the additional weighting factors A to be matrices. This involves, in view of (1.2), higher-dimensional representations of the permutation or braid groups.

Higher dimensional representations of the permutation group lead us to the old concept of *parastatistics*. There is a serious problem with these kinds of quantum statistics, however, which perhaps renders dubious the possibility of their physical realization in homogeneous many-body systems. The difficulty is, that the higher-dimensional representations do not interpolate in a smooth homogeneous way as one changes the number of particles. If one has, say, an n -particle system, and focuses on different $p < n$ -particle subsystems, one will generically find that these subsystems are governed by different rules.

A more fruitful way to proceed is to consider a number of different *species* of particles, distinguished say by internal quantum numbers α . Then one can have separate numbers $\theta_{\alpha\beta}$ for each pair of indices, and supply amplitude factors accordingly. This small formal step brings up what to me was a surprising point, that in the circle of ideas around quantum statistics the notion of indistinguishable particles is not necessarily central. Indeed the *mutual statistics* between different species, parameterized by $\theta_{\alpha\beta}$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$ is on exactly the same formal footing as the ordinary quantum statistics parameterized by $\theta_{\alpha\alpha}$. This sort of generalized statistics is quite commonly realized in the quantum Hall effect complex of states of matter.

One may also consider, along these lines, the possibility that the act of winding one type of particle around another changes internal quantum numbers. This situation arises in simple non-abelian generalizations of the type of field theories that in their abelian form lead to anyon and mutual statistics. The important homogeneity property which fails for traditional parastatistics will work here. I believe very rich mathematical structures arise in this way, but so far this generalization has not received much attention, and neither the classification nor the physical analysis of non-abelian statistics has been sufficiently developed.

So far we have discussed only ideal point particles. Extended objects provide important examples of anyons both in reality and in model field theories, as we shall see. They are anyons in the sense that the relative amplitudes for paths

where the extended objects remain well separated are weighted by phase factors as if they were point anyons. In favorable cases this may be sufficient information to determine important aspects of their dynamics at long wavelengths.

Finally I should mention what has been a very active area of investigation recently, that is quantum statistics in *one* space dimension. There is an element of arbitrariness in defining such statistics. Indeed the topology in path space simply counts the number of leftward minus rightward world-line crossings, and a phase at each crossing is just a form of scattering amplitude, distinguished from the effect of a local interaction only by its energy independence. However there are interesting model systems, describing for instance the boundary excitations of 2-space dimensional anyon systems, where one particular choice of statistics is obviously appropriate, and leads to an amazingly complete yet fairly simple description of the dynamics and statistical mechanics of these models.

2. Dynamical Realization of Statistical Transmutation

2.1. QUANTUM MECHANICAL CONSTRUCTION

So far we have worked at the level of quantum kinematics, and established at that level the possibility in principle of exotic possibilities for quantum statistics. To put some flesh on these bones, we need more substantial dynamical constructions.

The central physical idea underlying the exotic 2-space statistics is that particles may acquire intrinsically quantum mechanical phase factors as they wind around one another, proportional to the winding. This is highly reminiscent of an effect physicists are quite familiar with, the famous Aharonov-Bohm effect. Let me remind you that this is the effect that although outside an infinitely thin solenoid there is no magnetic field, and therefore no classical force, there is still a vector potential, and this vector potential can dramatically affect the behavior of charged particles in quantum mechanics. In fact the vector potential affects the particles

by imparting to their wave-functions a trajectory-dependent phase

$$\exp\left(iq \int_{r^{(I)}}^{r^{(F)}} a \cdot v dt\right) = \exp\left(iq \int_{r^{(I)}}^{r^{(F)}} a \cdot dr\right) . \quad (2.1)$$

One will have non-trivial interference effects due to these phase factors, if they give different phases for different trajectories with the same end-points. In the case at hand, the relative value of (2.1) for two trajectories T_1, T_2 is simply the exponential line integral of the vector potential over the closed path $(T_2)^{-1}T_1$ obtained by following T_1 from $r^{(I)}$ to $r^{(F)}$ and the reverse of T_2 from $r^{(F)}$ to $r^{(I)}$, and this is

$$\text{relative phase} = \exp(iq \oint a \cdot dr) = \exp(iq\Phi w) \quad (2.2)$$

where w is the winding number of this path around the solenoid and Φ is the magnetic flux the solenoid encloses.

(2.2) is exactly the sort of factor we need to implement the fractional statistics. Thus we can transmute the statistics of two-space dimensional particles by imparting to them fictitious charge and flux. From this vantage point, the crucial distinction between two and higher space dimensions is that in two dimensions flux *tubes* become flux *points*, so one has to take into account possible interactions due to phase factors of the Aharonov-Bohm type even in the dynamics of point particles.

2.2. FIELD THEORETIC REALIZATIONS

From these elementary considerations it is only a short step to what I believe is the most profound and useful way of viewing the whole circle of ideas around anyons, that is to see them as realizations of a special kind of gauge symmetry. Indeed, we can construct a field theory that implements the attachment of fictitious charge and flux to particles, as follows. Add to the standard point-particle action

in two space dimensions the interaction terms

$$\Delta\mathcal{S} = \int d^2x dt (qj \cdot a + \mu \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} a_\alpha \partial_\beta a_\gamma) . \quad (2.3)$$

In this expression, $j^\alpha(x, t) = \sum_k \frac{dx_k^\alpha}{dt} \delta^2(x - x_k(t))$ is the particle number current. The last term, multiplying μ , is called the Chern-Simons term after the mathematicians who discussed related concepts in quite a different, differential-geometric, context. Its existence, in this specific form, is obviously closely tied to the 2+1 dimensional nature of the models we are considering.

a is of course to be distinguished from the ordinary electromagnetic field, for which we shall reserve the symbol A . a is supposed to occur nowhere else in the action but only in the terms displayed in (2.3); in particular it has no Maxwell kinetic term. The equations of motion obtained by varying the a_α are

$$qj^\alpha = \mu \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} f_{\beta\gamma} , \quad (2.4)$$

where $f_{\beta\gamma} = \partial_\beta a_\gamma - \partial_\gamma a_\beta$ is the field strength. These are evidently invariant under the gauge transformation $a_\alpha \rightarrow a_\alpha + \partial_\alpha \lambda$, as we might have anticipated from (2.3). The $\alpha = 0$ component of the equation connect the particle density ρ to the fictitious magnetic field b according to the fundamental relation

$$q\rho = \mu b . \quad (2.5)$$

This is exactly the flux-attachment prescription we discussed before: the charged particles have become flux points as well. The $qj \cdot a$ terms insure that the particles do indeed interact as ordinary charged particles with respect to the fictitious field a , and so (2.3) has indeed captured the physics of statistical transmutation. Adding (2.3) to a given point-particle Lagrangian, with a conserved current j , will change the quantum statistics by

$$\Delta\theta = q^2/\mu . \quad (2.6)$$

It is instructive briefly to consider how a Hamiltonian treatment would go.

Since a_0 does not occur with time derivatives, (2.5) emerges as a constraint. Integrating by parts, we can also arrange that a_1 does not appear with time derivatives. Then its equation of motion generates a constraint that allows one to express a_2 in terms of the particle variables. Thus in principle by introducing (2.3) we have not added new degrees of freedom, but only modified the properties of the existing ones. Explicit elimination of the a_α in terms of the particle variables leads to unwieldy non-local expressions, however, so that if the fictitious field variables behave in a particularly simple or transparent way there may be great advantage to introducing them explicitly and keeping them in the foreground. As we will soon discuss, this is indeed the case.

Before entering into the applications, however, let me briefly mention how the various generalizations we previously contemplated at the level of kinematics can be realized in local gauge field theories. It is quite clear how to introduce mutual statistics. If there are several conserved particle currents $j_{(\mu)}$, and several gauge fields $a_{(\sigma)}$ one can transmute both self- and mutual statistics by adding to the action terms of the type

$$\Delta\mathcal{S} = \int d^2x dt (\Gamma_{(\lambda)(\mu)(\sigma)} q_\lambda j_{(\mu)} a_{(\sigma)} + N_{(\sigma)(\tau)} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} a_{(\sigma)\alpha} \partial_\beta a_{(\tau)\gamma}) , \quad (2.7)$$

Γ and N are numerical arrays, and we may suppose that N is symmetric. Such generality may seem like overkill, but in fact fairly elaborate theories of this kind are used to describe observed fractional quantized Hall effect states.

What about extended objects – including field, as opposed to point-particle, theories? In this direction too, once the simplest case is before us it is clear how to generalize. To make the statistical transmutation construction, we needed a conserved current. Indeed, only when we have a conserved charged will be able to identify in an unambiguous way “what it is” that is having its quantum statistics transmuted.

There are actually two cases to consider. If the current in question has a topological character, and is conserved independent of the equations of motion,

then we can just take over (2.3) for it directly. A nice example is the nonlinear σ -model of a field $\vec{n}$ with three internal components subject to the constraint $(\vec{n})^2 = 1$. It has the topological current

$$j^\alpha = \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} \epsilon_{abc} n^a \partial_\beta n^b \partial_\gamma n^c . \quad (2.8)$$

The statistical transmutation construction will alter the statistics of the solitons which carry this conserved charge, that is the so-called “baby Skyrmions”. In this case, if one eliminates the fictitious gauge field one finds that what one has added to the Lagrangian is a non-local integral representation of the Hopf invariant, a classic of topology.

More common is the case where the conservation law is associated with an internal symmetry. In that case, we can just follow the minimal coupling prescription to replace the $j \cdot a$ with a proper gauge-invariant generalization, and proceed as before. The quanta carrying the quantum numbers of the conserved current will have their statistics transmuted. The fictitious gauge fields will again not represent independent degrees of freedom, but rather a way of encoding properties of the particles – or rather, in this generality, the fields.

Non-abelian generalizations of these constructions are also possible. Many subtleties arise when one considers their global properties, but at the level of local equations of motion there is just one, and even it is quite simple. That is, the Chern-Simons term goes over into

$$\Delta \mathcal{S}_{\text{CS}} \propto \int d^2x dt \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} \text{Tr}(a_\alpha \partial_\beta a_\gamma + \frac{2}{3} a_\alpha [a_\beta, a_\gamma]) . \quad (2.9)$$

In this expression a matrix representation of the fields has been assumed, and Tr indicates the trace. The funny $\frac{2}{3}$ is necessary so that when one varies to get the equation of motion the proper gauge invariant field strength, *i.e.* $\partial_\alpha a_\beta - \partial_\beta a_\alpha + [a_\alpha, a_\beta]$, is obtained.

One might also inquire whether exotic statistics might arise more organically, within field theories that do not make use of these particular constructions. The answer to this question, of course, will also color our expectations regarding embodiments of exotic statistics in reality.

First let me make two preliminary remarks, that perhaps I should have made earlier. The requirement of two-space dimensionality might seem to be very restrictive, since real-world systems are at some level (it would seem) three-space dimensional. This restriction is easily breached, however. The point is that one may consider systems that are homogeneous in two directions but inhomogeneous in a third. At sufficiently low energies, it may be impossible to excite motion in the third direction. In that case, a two-dimensional description is strictly valid. Of course much of modern electronics takes place in an essentially two-dimensional world, and many of the most interesting interactions between material bodies takes place at their interfaces, so essentially two-space dimensional phenomena can be of direct physical interest.

Second, except in the cases of bosons and fermions quantum statistics appears to violate P and T symmetry, since the phase associated with world-lines winding one way is not the same as the phase associated with world-lines winding the opposite (that is, P- or T-reversed) way. Thus it would seem that to have exotic statistics we need to have these discrete space-time symmetries broken. Such symmetry breaking is of course not rare in condensed matter systems: it is the essence of magnetic order. Actually, though, it is not even strictly necessary. Even within an overall P- and T- conserving theory, there may be particles which are not P and T eigenstates. Thus for example a magnetic flux-point in two space dimensions, like a magnetic monopole in three space dimensions, is *not* a state of definite P and T – rather, those symmetries take these particles into their antiparticles! It might seem paradoxical that one should work with eigenstates of a P- and T- conserving Hamiltonian which are not eigenstates of P and T, but it is natural here because these operations do not commute with a quantity – that is, in both cases, total magnetic flux – which defines a superselection sector. Thus if we work – as exper-

imentalists are forced to – within a definite superselection sector, the symmetry is essentially useless. Similarly although naive P and T transformations change the sign of the Chern-Simons term in (2.7) (*i.e.* of the matrix N) in modified form they may still define valid symmetries, after being combined with a suitable transformation in internal space. Thus in general one may expect that exotic statistics is a valid possibility for the effective low-energy theory of excitations even within P- and T-conserving theories, in theories that have non-trivial superselection sectors.

From the point of view of general principles of effective theory, a crucial aspect of the terms in (2.7) is that they are of very low dimension. They involve only a small number of fields, and very few derivatives. Thus they are “relevant” operators in the technical sense, and if there is no symmetry to preclude them we must expect that they will control the physics at long wavelengths and low energy. Experience with integrating out the high-energy degrees of freedom in model 2+1 dimensional field theories bears this out, in that a Chern-Simons interaction often appears in the resulting low-energy effective field theory. Similarly, a dynamical calculation for quasiparticles in the fractional quantized Hall effect shows that they obey anyon statistics. And for flux tubes in non-abelian gauge theories it requires a conspiracy to *avoid* expressing exotic statistics.

3. The Master Phase Diagram

3.1. THE FLUX TRADING PARADIGM

A simple but powerful principle allows one to put the abstract idea of statistical transmutation to work as a tool for understanding the properties of two space-dimensional many-body problems. It was first mentioned as a possibility by Arovas, Schrieffer, Zee and myself in the same paper where the gauge theory of fractional statistics was first clearly formulated, but its real power only became clear when Laughlin used it to derive anyon superconductivity. A related, but (to my mind) less rigorously formulated idea helped motivate Jain to his remarkable constructions of

trial wave functions for the fractional quantum Hall effect. Greiter and I tried to put the essential idea in as clear and simple a form as possible, and it is that version I will show you today. I will also be alluding to very important subsequent work of Halperin, Lee, and Read, whose theory of compressible Hall states is probably the most impressive work in the field so far.

The principle is simply this: that it may be a valid approximation, in calculating certain low-energy properties, to replace the flux attached to a collection of anyons by its uniform average. Two questions will no doubt occur to you: why is this at all reasonable? and what is it good for? Let me answer these in turn.

What we are proposing is that it can be valid to replace a bumpy distribution of small amounts of flux attached to particle positions with a smoothed-out uniform flux. Intuitively, we might expect that quantum-mechanical uncertainty in position will tend to smooth out the particle positions – in particular, one cannot localize particles in a strong magnetic field better than to within the magnetic length $l_B = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{qB}}$. This argument cuts twice, in that we care about the effect of this field on the particles themselves, so that there is smoothing both from the source and from the probe.

A more correct and powerful argument, however, goes along quite different lines. Let us suppose that the change in statistics is small. Why not just treat it as a perturbation, full stop, without bothering about the uniform field? The difficulty with this procedure is that even a very small change in statistics produces a numerically large perturbation, for the following reason. A change in statistics is associated with a gauge field, as we have seen, whose vector potential must reflect the fundamental constraint (2.5). By integrating this constraint around a large circle, we see that the azimuthal vector potential must behave as

$$a_\phi(r) \sim \frac{q}{2\mu} \rho r , \tag{3.1}$$

using unit normalized (Cartesian) basis vectors. This vector potential grows as the size of the system, and clearly for a large system it cannot be treated as a small

perturbation. However, we may expand the Hamiltonian as

$$H = H_0 + (H - H_0) , \quad (3.2)$$

where in H_0 we use a uniform magnetic field of strength $q\rho/\mu$ instead of the true a_ϕ , and in $H - H_0$ restore the residual terms. In this way we may hope to arrive at a tractable problem for H_0 – which is still fairly simple, since it involves particles moving in a uniform background field – and a perturbation to it that is genuinely small, because the dangerous long-range pieces, which would show up as infrared divergences, have been subtracted off.

One expects that generically a small regular perturbation of a many-body system with a gap in its energy spectrum will not destroy the gap. Thus one expects, from the argument I just outlined, that if one can trade statistics for uniform magnetic field along the lines

$$\Delta \frac{1}{\nu} = \Delta \frac{\theta}{\pi} \quad (3.3)$$

in the magnetic field-statistic plane, where

$$\nu \equiv \frac{\rho}{qB} , \quad (3.4)$$

the so-called filling fraction, is the ratio of the actual density to that necessary to fill one Landau level. More precisely, one expects that generically as one moves along such lines states with energy gaps – incompressible states – will be related to other, qualitatively similar incompressible states.

In writing (3.4), I have snuck in a crucial physical point by notational sleight-of-hand. Whereas the preceding discussion has related to fictitious fields, the uniform field we finally used in our approximation has exactly the same effect as an honest-to-goodness applied magnetic field. Thus we are approximating anyons of one type in a given uniform magnetic field by anyons of another type in a different uniform magnetic field, as is implicit in (3.4).

3.2. A TOUR OF THE QUANTUM HALL COMPLEX

With this background, I can now present the centerpiece of this talk, Figure 1, which I call the Master Diagram. It shows in what I hope is clear and easily comprehensible form how the simple ideas just outlined can be used to give a coherent account of several different exotic states of two-dimensional matter – a “grand unified theory” of the quantum Hall complex. I would like now to take you on a brief tour of the Master Diagram.

If we start from fermions and gradually but monotonically change the statistics, we will eventually arrive back at fermions. Of course, the final state in this process, being a state of fermions, is a candidate state to describe electrons again. In the new state the electrons will be in a different magnetic field, and may have acquired very different correlations in the course of the adiabatic flux-trading procedure, but if the initial state has an energy gap the final state has a good chance of sharing that property.

Let us first apply this procedure starting with a state for which the existence of an energy gap can be argued on very general grounds, that is a single filled Landau level ($\nu = 1$). Moving along the $\Delta(1/\nu) = \Delta(\theta/\pi)$, we reach fermions again when $\Delta\theta = 2\pi$, that is $\Delta(1/\nu) = 2$ or $\nu = 1/3$. One may continue along this line to reach $\nu = 1/5, 1/7, \dots$ – the filling fractions described by the classic Laughlin theory of the fractional quantized Hall effect. The incompressibility of these states is a true many-body property, that is just plain false in the absence of interactions. Indeed, there is a vast degeneracy for non-interacting fermions partially filling a Landau band, reflecting the many choices available for which single-particle states to fill. It is quite remarkable that one is led to anticipate the incompressibility of these states from such simple arguments, based only on the stability of what appears to be a controlled perturbation theory. Although I am not the person to do it, I feel confident that a rigorous proof of the incompressibility of simple fractional Hall effect states, which has so far been elusive, could be constructed along these lines.

If we start with two filled Landau levels and follow the same logic we arrive at

filling fractions $2/5, 2/9, \dots$; and so forth. In this way, a large number of fractional quantized Hall states can be built up. This is closely related to most elementary version of constructions carried to a high level of sophistication by Jain (and backed up by some brilliant analytic and numerical work). The standard hierarchy construction can also be discussed in this framework, if one combines the flux-trading construction for elementary particles with a “dual” construction applying transmuting vortices of the gauge fields on preceding levels and iterates. These vortices of course have a conserved topological current, and are therefore subject to the transmutation construction as previously discussed.

Quite a different use of the same idea is to extrapolate along these lines toward zero magnetic field, rather than toward Fermi statistics. If one hits zero magnetic field while maintaining a gap in the single particle spectrum, one has produced a candidate superfluid. For at zero magnetic field there is no longer a preferred density, and one expects a collective mode of density waves whose energy should go to zero at long wavelengths. These are stable according the Landau criterion – because there is an energy gap for ordinary quasiparticle excitations, decay of the collective mode is forbidden by energy-momentum conservation. According to modern understanding one must establish somewhat more than this for true superfluidity, and there is some controversy whether one has true superfluidity for these states, though I at least am convinced one does (to the extent one can in two space dimensions; that is, in the sense of Kosterlitz-Thouless theory). In any case something very interesting happens, and we can identify the statistics for whatever it is occurs. Starting from n filled Landau levels, one extrapolates according to the master formula (3.3) to zero magnetic field for statistics $\theta/\pi = 1 - 1/n$. Ideal quantum fluids of particles with these statistics are predicted to be superfluids at zero temperature, a concept which has received much support from expansions in $1/n$, random-phase and Hartree-Fock calculations, and numerical work. A particularly interesting case is $n = 1$, which corresponds to bosons! One does indeed expect the hard-core Bose gas to form a superfluid, but it is perhaps somewhat startling to trace the ancestry of this classic superfluid to a filled Landau

level. The case $n = 2$, or semions, arises in some ideas about high-temperature superconductivity, but unfortunately these ideas have failed the test of experiment, at least in their simplest form.

Finally, following Halperin, Lee, and Read, let us consider extrapolating from fermions in *zero* magnetic field, that is $\nu = \infty$. This is a bold thing to try, because the starting point is not a system with a gap, and one is doing degenerate perturbation theory from the get-go. However, one has become accustomed, from Landau's Fermi liquid theory, to the idea that Fermi surface is quite robust against (repulsive) perturbations. Roughly speaking, this is because although there is no gap there is effectively a very small phase space for interactions, due to the exclusion principle. The vanishing phase space over-cancels the vanishing energy denominators. Extrapolating, then, according to (3.3) one arrives back at fermions for $\nu = 1/2$. One is led, therefore, to predict that there should be Fermi surface effects at $\nu = 1/2$, notably including the existence of a wealth of low-energy fermionic quasiparticles that propagate in straight lines (the eigenstates of H_0 , in the sense of (3.2)). Remarkably, several such effects have indeed been observed, and agree at least semi-quantitatively with the theory.

In view of the boldness of the extrapolation in this last application, one must examine the effect of the restoring the dynamics of the fictitious gauge field, *i. e.* of applying $H - H_0$ to the putative ground state. An adiabatic approach is impractical, since the Pauli exclusion principle is not built in at intermediate stages, so to do any explicit calculation it appears one must resort to perturbation theory. Since the perturbation is in no sense small numerically – the statistics has been changed by 2π – special techniques must be used. Nayak and I, using an unusual renormalization group argument, found that at low energies (as the quasi-particle energies approach the Fermi surface) one is led toward small effective couplings, but only logarithmically. This justifies the free theory as a self-consistent approximation at low energies, but also indicates its fundamental limitations. Some further discussion of these ideas, including a proposal for a crucial experimental test, is given below.

4. Properties of the Quasiparticles

Some of the most interesting properties of the states in the quantum Hall complex relates to the elementary excitations about them. I shall now describe how some of these properties are manifested directly in elementary space-time processes [1] .

4.1. EXISTENCE AND PECULIARITIES

The localized particle-like character, and the fractional charge and quantum statistics, of the quasiparticles in the fractional quantized Hall effect is a very plausible consequence of the concepts we have discussed in connection with the Master Diagram. The localized nature of the allowed density fluctuations follows from the incompressible nature of the state: to create an inhomogeneous charge one needs to exceed a definite threshold, and above this threshold one creates quasiparticles in a localized region. This is the only option, because the bulk state has a preferred density, and it would cost a finite energy per unit area to vary from that density. Moreover in moving from the single filled Landau level to the $\nu = 1/3$ state, for instance, we cranked up two extra units of quantized flux on the electrons. These, when added to the effective single unit of flux connected with Fermi statistics, yield the result that a phase of 6π is accumulated as one electron circles another. This provides a strong hint that the electron is not the most elementary excitation. The most elementary excitation, that provides the minimal flux consistent with not disturbing the boundary conditions on electrons arbitrarily far away, should be associated with phase accumulation 2π . Since it takes three of these to reproduce the effect of an electron, one should expect that each such elementary excitation carries one-third the quantum numbers of the electron. Applied to electric charge, this argument clearly leads to the assignment $e/3$ for the quasiparticles. For statistics the division is not unambiguous (because the statistical parameter is defined only modulo 2π) but one might expect that the most economical value, $\theta = \pi/3$, is realized. This value is indeed what the microscopic theory indicates.

4.2. QUANTUM DRIFTS

The first chapter of almost any text on plasma physics contains the theory of particle drifts, that is the motion of charged particles subject to a strong uniform magnetic field and additional weak fields. The leading motion is fast cyclotron motion in circles of radius $r_{\text{cyc.}} = \frac{pc}{qB}$ at frequency $\omega_{\text{cyc.}} = \frac{qB}{mc}$. The “guiding center” of this circle undergoes slow drifts if there are additional smooth, weak fields, due to non-cancellation of impulses around the cyclotron orbit.

In quantum mechanics another parameter of length becomes available, that is the quantum magnetic length scale $l_{\text{quantum}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{qB}}$. For very strong fields evidently $l_{\text{quantum}} > r_{\text{cyc.}}$ and the classical cyclotron orbits lose their meaning. The drifts must be calculated in a different way, and the results are different. For example, since the classical equations of motion depend only on the charge-to-mass ratio q/m observations of the classical drifts of a particle do not allow one to infer a definite value of the charge; but as it turns out the quantum drifts do.

The quantum drifts are of considerable intrinsic interest, and of specific interest for the quantum Hall effect, since the quasiparticles are predicted to be fractionally charged, and perforce must be studied in the presence of a large background magnetic field. They are well within the quantum drift regime.

Another way of thinking about the quantum drifts is that they represent the dynamical response of particles confined, in energy space, to the lowest Landau level. From this point of view we see right away that straightforward perturbation theory is insufficient for this problem, because the problem is highly degenerate. One can make progress by assuming cylindrical symmetry for the perturbing fields. Then the perturbing Hamiltonian is diagonal in canonical angular momentum, and since the lowest Landau level contains just one level for each non-negative canonical angular momentum one can calculate each level separately, then sew together wave packets and follow the dynamics.

I refer you to the reference mentioned in [1] for a full discussion, including some numerical simulation and computer-generated pictures of representative motions.

4.3. MASS RENORMALIZATION AND TIME-OF-FLIGHT

As mentioned above, Halperin, Lee and Read proposed a striking description of the compressible Hall state near filling fraction $\nu = 1/2$, that has gained considerable experimental support. Their theory is based on the idea of approximating the electrons by fermions in *zero* magnetic field. It is proposed that correlations among the electrons are such as to cancel the effect of the imposed magnetic field, so that the dressed quasiparticles have the quantum numbers of electrons but travel (to a first approximation) in straight lines. The special feature of $\nu = 1/2$ is that attaching notional two-unit flux tubes to the electrons formally does not alter their properties, yet it involves a vector potential which cancels off the growing part of the real imposed vector potential. One hopes to treat the difference as a perturbation.

The perturbative treatment of the statistical gauge field is intrinsically limited, however, because the coupling is neither small nor truly short-ranged. Nor, since it is essentially a magnetic coupling, is it effectively screened. Nevertheless one may hope to justify the simple theory, similarly to the way one justifies the use of perturbation theory in QCD, by showing that the *effective* coupling can become weak in an appropriate limit.

We are concerned with the long-wavelength behavior, specifically with the question whether infrared divergences associated with the deviation of the statistical gauge field from a uniform constant – in other words, with its fluctuations – are suppressed. This formulation of the problem suggests the use of a renormalization group approach.

Now the longitudinal electric fluctuations of the gauge field should be screened more or less in the usual way, and the dangerous fluctuations are the magnetic ones. Since in the Chern-Simons theory the magnetic field is enslaved to density fluctuations, it is important to consider the effect of additional long-range repulsive interactions, which tend to suppress such fluctuations. For the sake of generality, one considers a $1/|k|^x$ interaction, where $x = 1$ is the realistic Coulomb case.

Among the coupling in a non-relativistic Lagrangian is the mass term $\frac{1}{2m^*}(\nabla\psi)^2$, and it turns out that the crucial renormalization for the gauge theory is the renormalization of m^* as one scales toward low energies, and momenta on the Fermi surface. Indeed since the fundamental coupling is magnetic, an increase in m^* tends to suppress it. We find a fixed point for the effective coupling at $\alpha^* = (1-x)/4$; for the Coulomb case there is a logarithmic approach to zero coupling. For this case the effective mass behaves as

$$m^*(\omega) \rightarrow \text{const.} \ln \frac{1}{|\omega|} \quad (4.1)$$

as one approaches the Fermi surface at $\omega = 0$. Notice that this mass diverges at the Fermi surface, so that strictly speaking the Fermi liquid theory does not apply, although many of its qualitative features survive with only small corrections. Clearly the predicted behavior (4.1) is of fundamental interest, as is the question whether it can be seen directly in space-time.

Actually to do this would seem to require only that some beautiful measurements of Goldman, Su, and Jain be extended. These authors tested some fundamental properties of the quasiparticles by working in magnetic fields $B_{1/2} + \delta B$ slightly different from those which give exactly $\nu = 1/2$. The quasiparticles are then supposed to see the effective field δB , which causes them to move in large cyclotron orbits. In fact since the cyclotron radius is $r = pc/(e\delta B)$ (here the small-field, classical theory applies!) and the momentum is cut off at the Fermi surface there is predicted to be a minimum radius, a prediction which was verified experimentally using a two-slit arrangement. Now what is required to test (4.1) is clearly that the *time of flight* should be measured as a function of the radius; from it one readily obtains the velocity and then, knowing the momentum, the effective mass.

REFERENCES

1. This manuscript for the most part sticks close to the talk as given. It is meant to be a light but sophisticated introduction for non-experts. Accordingly, and because I am writing it in isolated conditions, I have not attempted to supply a scholarly set of references. Please do not assume that any specific unfamiliar remark found here is original, though some are. Section 4 on quasiparticle propagation is based on recent collaborative work done with my students R. Levien and C. Nayak, available as IASSNS-HEP 94/108 and 95/67.

